DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 331 236 EC 300 217

AUTHOR Rusch, Frank R.; And Others
TITLE Co-Worker Involvement Scoring Manual and Instrument.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 31p.; In: Rusch, Frank R., Research in Secondary Special Education and Transitional Employment; see EC 300 209.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; *Behavior Rating Scales; *Disabilities; Employees; Employment Programs; Interaction; Interpersonal Communication; Job Placement; *Peer Relationship; Social Integration; *Supported Employment; Test Reliability
IDENTIFIERS Coworker Involvement Instrument (Rusch et al)

ABSTRACT

Because of their consistent presence in the work environment, co-workers have been identified as a potentially powerful resource available to provide support to employees with disabilities in supported employment programs. The "Co-worker Involvement Instrument" allows employment training specialists and job supervisors to estimate co-worker involvement with target employees after job placement. The items on the instrument assess physical integration, social integration, training, frequency of associating, appropriateness of associating, befriending, advocating, evaluating, and giving information. Studies have found the instrument to demonstrate good interrater and test-retest reliability. This paper includes a copy of the instrument, a glossary, and instructions for scoring co-workers and for scoring employment site demographics. (28 references) (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Co-worker Involvement Scoring Manual and Instrument

Frank R. Rusch, Carolyn Hughes, Jeff McNair, and Philip G. Wilson

ED331236

The Co-worker Involvement Instrument allows employment training specialists and job supervisors to estimate co-worker involvement with employees (target employees) after job placement. This instrument is based upon research that assumes that co-worker involvement enhances job performance as a result of social interactions between target employees and their co-workers. Greater co-worker involvement in conjunction with employment training specialist (ETS) assistance, for example, may be associated with an increased likelihood of job retention, greater work productivity, and enhanced cost effectiveness of employee training methods.

The primary purpose of the Co-worker Involvement Instrument is to assess the extent to which co-workers are involved with target employees at specific job placements. This instrument is a companion to the Co-worker Involvement Training Manual, which describes interventions for increasing co-worker involvement with target employees. This manual is available upon request from the first author. The Co-worker Involvement Instrument is designed to be used before and after co-worker intervention.

The Co-worker Involvement Instrument is designed to be used by employment training specialists (ETS) and job supervisors. Because co-workers tend to rate their peer's performance leniently (White & Rusch, 1983), employment training specialists or supervisors should conduct all interviews to obtain the information needed to complete the Co-worker Involvement Instrument. This instrument contains the following items.

1. Physical Integration
2. Social Integration
3. Training
4. Associating (frequency)
5. Associating (appropriateness)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EC 300217

6. Befriending
7. Advocating
8. Evaluating
9. Giving Information

A recent study of the psychometric properties of the Co-worker Involvement Instrument demonstrated good reliability. McNair and Rusch (1989) reported an interrater reliability coefficient of .80.

A test-retest reliability study found a correlation of r = .88. A total of 54 raters scored the Instrument two times separated by a time period of 9 days (mean). The comparison of the rating at Time 1 with that at Time 2 (9 days later) yielded the test-retest coefficient of .88.

Part 1: Co-Worker Involvement Scoring Manual

Supporting Research

The limited success demonstrated by sheltered workshops in providing meaningful employment opportunities to persons with handicaps has led to the development of alternative service-delivery models that "support" employment in integrated settings (Bellamy, Rhodes, Bourbeau, & Mank, 1986). Supported employment focuses upon "competitive work in an integrated work setting for individuals who, because of their handicaps, need ongoing support services to perform that work" (Federal Register, August 14, 1987, p. 30546). Supported employment also provides opportunities for persons with handicaps to interact with nonhandicapped employees. In fact, employment integration may be the distinguishing characteristic of supported employment (Chadsey-Rusch, 1986). Except for research reported by Chadsey-Rusch and Gonzalez (1988), we know very little about social interactions that occur between employees with and without handicaps. Chadsey-Rusch and Gonzalez (1988) suggest that employees with handicaps interact with co-workers and that the purpose of these interactions is to share information, tease and joke with others, and ask questions.

Supported employment also is distinguished by the "support" provided to target employees by their co-workers. Only recently, however, has this support been recognized as potentially important to the long-term employment of supported employees. Lagomarcino and Rusch (1988) and Rusch and Minch (1988) overviewed several studies whereby co-workers were taught to serve as change agents in competitive employment situations. For example, Rusch and Menchetti (1981) taught co-workers to deliver a verbal warning to a food service employee with moderate mental retardation who was failing to comply with requests made by supervisors, co-workers, and cooks. Co-workers also were taught to report the results of the intervention to follow-up support staff. The warnings positively affected the performance of the target employee. In fact, this target employee has remained in his

original job placement since 1978, which followed almost 17 years of state institutionalization.

Because of their consistent presence in the work environment, co-workers have been identified as a potentially powerful resource available to provide support to supported employees (Rusch, 1986; Rusch, Hughes, Johnson, & Minch, 1988; Rusch & Minch, 1988; Shafer, 1986). Based on their analysis of both business management and sociology of work literature, Nisbet and Hagner (in press) observe that considerable social interaction and support among co-workers are characteristic of natural work environments. These researchers conclude that promoting co-worker involvement as a natural support may be one means of providing consistent, ongoing follow-up services in integrated work settings.

Co-workers refer to employees who meet one or more of the following criteria: (a) work in the proximity of the supported employee, (b) perform the same or similar duties as the target employee, and (c) take breaks or eat meals in the same area as the target employee. Rusch and Minch (1988) identified five types of co-worker support that have been reported by applied researchers who have enlisted the involvement of co-workers. This involvement included: (a) validating instructional strategies (Rusch & Menchetti, 1981; Schutz, Rusch, & Lamson, 1979), (b) collecting subjective evaluations (Crouch, Rusch, & Karlan, 1984; Schutz, Jostes, Rusch, & Lamson, 1979; White & Rusch, 1983), (c) implementing training procedures (Kochany, Simpson, Hill, & Wehman, 1982; Rusch, Weithers, Menchetti, & Schutz, 1980; Stanford & Wehman, 1982), (d) collecting social comparison information (Crouch et al., 1984; Rusch, Morgan, Martin, Riva, & Agran, 1985), and (e) maintaining work performance after skill acquisition (Kochany et al., 1981; Rusch et al., 1985).

Rusch, Hughes, Johnson, and Minch (1988) extended the findings of Rusch and Minch (1988) by describing the type of co-worker involvement reported among target employees in model supported employment programs in Illinois. Findings indicated that the types of co-worker involvement that have been described in the literature exist in supported

employment settings. Specifically, Rusch et al. (1988) indicated that the greatest percentage of target employees had co-workers who served as associates (87%), followed by evaluators (70%), trainers (61%), advocates (42%), friends (20%), and data collectors (17%).

Subsequently, Rusch, Johnson, and Hughes (1990) described patterns of co-worker involvement in relation to placement approach. Specifically, this study sought to describe the type of co-worker involvement being reported by job coaches who place their target employees individually or in groups. Target employees who were employed in mobile work crews were much less involved with co-workers. Target employees who were individually placed or who worked in clusters were more involved with co-workers. Their findings indicated that supported employees associate extensively with their nonhandicapped co-workers when the opportunity for co-worker involvement exists.

In summary, supported employment has emerged as a major employment alternative for persons with handicaps. This employment alternative is characterized by the target employee earning a wage in a nonsheltered work setting, with support being provided to the target employee. Research conducted in natural work settings suggests that support may be provided by co-workers, as well as by the employment training specialists. Currently, co-worker involvement is being provided to supported employees in terms of associating, evaluating, training, advocating, befriending, and collecting data.

Glossary

Advocating — Co-worker advocates for target employees by optimizing, backing, and supporting the target employee's employment status. Optimizing refers to encouraging a supervisor to assign high-status and relevant tasks to the target employee, backing refers to supporting target employee's rights, for example, by attempting to prevent practical jokes aimed at the target employee. It also includes speaking up for the target employee or offering explanations during differences of opinion. Supporting relates to providing emotional support to the target employee, for example, in the form of friendship or association.

Associating — Co-worker interacts socially with the target employee at the work place.

Befriending — The co-worker interacts socially with target employee outside of the work place.

Clerical — Work related to processing information (e.g., file clerk, secretary, receptionist, typist, data processor) (Trach, Rusch, & DeStefano, 1987).

Cluster — A work situation where more than two target employees perform the same or similar work in the same location and where the target employees are provided ongoing supervision.

Cluster (dispersed) — A working situation where: (1) more than two target employees are working for the same employer but often perform the same or different job assignments in different locations, and (2) the target employees are provided ongoing supervision.

Comparable Work — Work that is performed by a co-worker that is the same or similar to work performed by the target employee.

Competitive Employment — Work that produces valued goods or services at a minimum wage or more and in a setting that includes nonhandicapped workers and provides opportunities for advancement (Rusch, 1986).

Co-worker Involvement — The co-worker interacts with a target employee either by training, associating, befriending, advocating, evaluating, or providing information to that target employee.

Co-workers — Employees who meet one or more of the following criteria: (a) work in the proximity of the target employee, (b) perform comparable work, and (c) have breaks or eat meals in the same area as the target employee.

Employment Training Specialists (ETS) (Job Coach) — An individual providing ongoing support services to the target employee throughout each step of the employment process, including job survey and development, job match, job placement, job maintenance, job-related services, and interagency collaboration. "Ongoing support services" means continuous or periodic job skill training services provided at least twice

monthly at the work site throughout the term of employment to enable the individual to perform the work. The term also includes other support services provided at or away from the work site, such as transportation, personal care services, and counseling to family members, if skill training services are also needed by and provided to, that individual at the work site" (Federal Register, 1987, p. 30551).

Employment Training Specialist (ETS) (Job Coach)/Co-worker Involvement — The ETS assists directly or indirectly in encouraging co-worker involvement that results in improved target employee performances.

Evaluating — A co-worker appraises a target employee's work performance and provides (written/oral) feedback to him/her.

Food Services — Work related to preparing and serving food to people in a restaurant setting (e.g., server, busperson, dishwasher) (Trach et al., 1987).

Giving Information — The co-worker acts as a source of information by spontaneously volunteering instruction/feedback (regarding vocational skills, social skills, etc.) and in answering target employee's questions.

Health Care — Work related to the provision of health care services in a hospital, hospice, nursing home, or employee's residence (e.g., nurse's aide, bed stripper, recreation therapist's helper) (Trach et al., 1987).

Individual Placement — The placement of an individual into non-sheltered employment, typically without the presence of other workers with disabilities who perform the same job (e.g., dishwasher who works in a restaurant, janitor who works in a state office building) (Rusch, Trach, Winking, Tines, & Schutz, 1987).

Individualized Written Rehabilitation Plan (IWRP) — An Individualized Written Rehabilitation Plan outlines the services provided to individuals served in an employment program, including a description of the extended services needed, the identification of the state, federal, or private programs that will provide the continuing

support, and a description of the basis for determining that continuing support is available (Federal Register, 1987).

Integration — The extent to which the target employee has opportunities to interact with nonhandicapped co-workers. Integration has two aspects:

Physical Integration — The co-workers work, take breaks, and eat meals in the same areas at the same time as the target employee.

Social Integration — While completing his/her work, the target employee has an appropriate number of opportunities to interact with co-workers without negative effects on job performance.

Laundry — Work related to laundering of clothes or linens (e.g., towel machine operator, sheet ironer) (Trach et al., 1987).

Light Industrial — Work related to manufacturing a product or preparing a product for market (e.g., assembly benchwork, production line worker) (Trach et al., 1987).

Maintenance (janitorial and/or grounds) — Work related to improving or maintaining a building's appearance (e.g., janitor, maid, building repair person) and/or work related to maintaining grounds to be attractive, functional, and safe (e.g., lawn maintenance, gardening, leaf and snow removal, salting ice, removal of debris, trash collection, repair of sidewalks, painting) (Trach et al., 1987).

Mobile Crew Model — A situation where several individuals work together and perform a job at various community worksites (e.g., a janitorial crew) (Rusch et al., 1987).

Ongoing Support Services — See "Employment Training Specialist."

Retail — Work related to selling merchandise or services to consumers (e.g., clerk, gas station attendant, grocery bagger) (Trach et al., 1987).

Social Interaction — Events in which the target employee and co-worker are actively involved with each other are considered social interaction only when these events are appropriate within the context of the work place. Social interaction includes verbal

exchange, physical gestures that elicit a response, or physical contact (Chadsey-Rusch & Gonzalez, 1986).

Supervisor — Employee present at the job site who is responsible for the performance and evaluation of the target employee during his or her work shift.

Supported Employment — Paid employment which: (1) is for persons with disabilities for whom competitive employment at or above the minimum wage is unlikely and who because of their disabilities, need ongoing support to perform in a work setting, (2) is conducted in a variety of settings, particularly work sites in which persons without disabilities are employed, and (3) is supported by any activity needed to sustain paid work by persons with disabilities, including supervision, training, and transportation (Federal Register, 1984).

Target Employee — Individual who, because of the severity of a handicapping condition, cannot function independently in employment without intensive ongoing support services for the duration of their employment (Federal Register, 1987).

Training — The co-worker supports a target employee by providing on-the-job skill training.

Vocational Assessment and Curriculum Guide (VACG) — The VACG is a psychometrically validated behavior rating scale designed to provide measures of vocational and social skill competence in selected industries, including food services, janitorial services, and light industry. The VACG comprises eight skill domains including attendance/endurance, independence, production, learning behavior, communication social skills, and self-help skills (Menchetti & Rusch, 1988; Rusch, Schutz, Mithaug, Stewart, & Mar, 1982).

Warehouse — Work related to shipping and receiving goods (e.g., stocking, loading/unloading trucks, delivery person) (Trach et al., 1987).

Work Performance Evaluation Form (WPEF) — The WPEF is a questionnaire displaying many of the social and vocational skills that are of concern to employers, supervisors,

and co-workers. The WPEF was developed to provide employers and supervisors with a means of evaluating employee progress and communicating the evaluation results to placement trainers on a regular basis (Rusch & Mithaug, 1980; White & Rusch, 1983).

Instructions for Scorers

General Instructions

The Co-worker Involvement Instrument is designed to be scored by employment training specialists or supervisors who have worked in the target job site for a minimum of three months. It is assumed that employment training specialists and supervisors will have a high degree of familiarity with the job site, the target employee, and co-workers. The instrument itself contains nine items. Each item has three forced choices resulting in a score of 2, 1, or 0. Scoring procedures are similar for each item, and, in each case, items are scored on the basis of information gathered from relevant documents, observations, and/or verbal reports. Verbal reports may be solicited from the target employee, co-workers, supervisors, or employment training specialists. Co-workers may be identified as potential sources of verbal reports by asking the target employee who he/she talks to on the job.

Validation of Verbal Report

To be considered valid, the co-worker's or target employee's verbal report must be corroborated by either the target employee (in the case of a co-worker report), another co-worker, an employment training specialist, or a supervisor. Individuals such as parents, group home parents, or independent living staff also can be used for validation in the case of Item 7 (Befriending). Once the information is validated, that particular information can be used in the scoring of the Co-worker Involvement Instrument. If the information is not validated by any of the above mentioned persons, the scorer must disregard that information and begin again with another co-worker. If three co-workers have been approached and none of them talk with the target employee and do not know of anyone who does, the process is stopped. The Co-worker Involvement Instrument then is scored based upon observational and relevant document data only.

Objective of the Co-worker Involvement Instrument

The objective of this instrument is to determine the type and degree of co-worker involvement being provided to target employees. A completed instrument represents co-worker involvement with a target employee, rather than overall support present at a particular job site. The attached co-worker involvement instrument is intended to be completed on a single employee. Additional copies must be scored on other target employees who may be working at the same job site (e.g., in dispersed and clustered placements).

Co-worker Involvement Index Scoring Procedures

Item 1:

Physical Integration — The target employee works, takes breaks, and eats meals in the same areas at the same time as the co-worker(s).

2 - The target employee works in the same areas at the same time as the co-workers a portion of the day and takes breaks and eats meals in the same areas at the same time as co-workers.

1 - The target employee does not work in the same areas at the same time as the co-workers but takes breaks and/or eats meals in the same areas at the same time as the co-workers (or vice versa).

0 - The target employee does not work, take breaks, or eat meals in the same areas at the same time as co-workers.

Instructions for Scoring Item 1

The employment training specialist or supervisor directly observes the target employee during actual work on the job, breaks, during transitions (e.g., task or location change), and lunch. Relevant documents may also be consulted, however, it is not recommended that they be the sole basis for scoring this item, as the target employee's situation may have changed without documents being updated.

Observations

- During lunch and work breaks
- During actual work on-the-job

Relevant documents

- Work schedule
- Observational records

Item 2:

Social Integration — While completing his/her work or during breaks, the target employee regularly has opportunities to interact with co-workers without negative effects on job performance.

2- There are regularly occurring opportunities for the target employee to interact with co-workers without negative effects on job performance.

1- There are few opportunities for target employees to interact with co-workers without negative effects on job performance.

0- There are no opportunities for the target employee to interact with the co-workers without negative effects on job performance.

Instructions for Scoring Item 2

The employment training specialist or supervisor directly observes the target employee during actual work on the job. In addition, the job description and work schedule are evaluated in light of available target employee work performance measures. This information is used to determine if the target employee works in a situation that allows for social integration comparable with that of his/her co-workers. Further information may be gathered from interviews with co-workers working in the target employee's vicinity regarding how the target employee's work is performed as reflected in opportunities to interact with co-workers.

Observations

- During actual work on the job
- During breaks

Verbal report

- By co-workers

Relevant documents

- Work Performance Evaluation Form (WPEF)
- Company job description
- Work schedules

Item 3:

Training — The co-worker supports a target employee by providing on-the-job skill training.

2 - A co-worker independently provides on-the-job training to the target employee in an effort to improve the employee's work performance.

1 - A co-worker provides on-the-job training to target employee only when provided assistance (e.g., prompting, instruction, feedback) by an employment training specialist or supervisor.

0 - A co-worker does not provide on-the-job training to the target employee.

Instructions for Scoring Item 3

The employment training specialist or supervisor directly observes the target employee on the job, during breaks, during transitions (e.g., task or location change) and during lunch to determine the extent to which training is provided by co-workers. Co-worker's verbal reports also may be utilized. For a co-worker's or target employee's solicited or unsolicited verbal report of training to be considered valid, the report must be corroborated by either a supervisor, the employment training specialist, the target employee, or another co-worker. The employment training specialist's or supervisor's report of an occurrence of training will be accepted without corroboration.

Observations

- During lunch and work breaks
- During actual work on the job
- During transitions (e.g., task or location change)

Verbal report

- By co-workers or target employee

- By supervisor or employment training specialist

Relevant documents

- Direct observational records as recorded by supervisor or employment training specialist, such as daily observational data

- Individualized Written Rehabilitation Plan (IWRP)

Item 4:

Associating (frequency) — A co-worker socially interacts with the target employee at the work place.

2 - A co-worker socially interacts with the target employee at the work place on a regular basis typically on a daily basis.

1 - A co-worker socially interacts with the target employee at the work place on an irregular basis, usually only two to three times per week.

0 - Co-workers do not interact socially with the target employee or co-workers interact socially with the target employee at the workplace rarely, oftentimes only once a week or less.

Instructions for Scoring Item 4

The employment training specialist or supervisor directly observes the target employee during actual work on-the-job, breaks, transitions (e.g., task or location change) and lunch to determine the frequency of associating between co-worker(s) and the target employee. Co-worker's or target employee's verbal reports of associating may be elicited. To be considered valid, however, either of these reports must be corroborated by one of the following persons: supervisor, employment training specialist, target employee, or another co-worker. The employment training specialist's or supervisor's report of an occurrence of associating will be accepted without corroboration, as will their written direct observational records.

Observations

- During lunch and work breaks
- During actual work on the job
- During transitions (e.g., arrival/departure, task or location change)

Verbal report

- By co-workers or target employee
- By supervisor or employment training specialist

Relevant documents

- Direct observational records as recorded by supervisor or employment training specialist, such as daily observational data

Item 5:

Associating (appropriateness) — A co-worker interacts socially with the target employee in a manner considered appropriate within the context of the work place.

2 - The majority of a co-workers' social interactions with a target employee are considered appropriate within the context of the workplace.

1 - Some of a co-worker's social interactions with a target employee are considered appropriate within the context of the workplace.

0 - There are few or no social interactions considered appropriate within the context of the workplace between the target employee and co-workers.

Instructions for Scoring Item 5

The employment training specialist or supervisor directly observes the target employee during actual work on the job, breaks, transitions (e.g., task or location change), and lunch to determine the appropriateness of associations between a co-worker and a target employee. Co-worker's or target employee's verbal reports may be elicited. Support for a co-worker's or target employee's solicited or unsolicited verbal report of the appropriateness of an association(s) will be required by corroboration of either a supervisor, the employment training specialist, target employee, or another co-worker. The employment training

specialist's or supervisor's report of the appropriateness of an association will be accepted without corroboration.

Observations

- During lunch and work breaks
- During actual work on the job
- During transitions (e.g., arrival/departure, task or location change)

Verbal report

- By co-workers or target employee
- By supervisor or employment training specialist

Relevant documents

- Direct observational records as recorded by supervisor or employment training specialist, such as daily observational data

Item 6:

Befriending — A co-worker befriends the target employee by interacting socially with the target employee outside of the workplace.

2- A co-worker and the target employee report interacting socially outside the workplace at least once a month.

1- A co-worker and the target employee report interacting socially outside the workplace less than once a month.

0- A co-worker and the target employee report not interacting socially outside the workplace.

Instructions for Scoring Item 6

Identification of the target employee's friends may be obtained by first asking the target employee or someone familiar with him/her (co-worker, supervisor, employment training specialist, parent, group home parent, independent living staff) who his/her friends are at the workplace. Corroborative evidence of social interactions outside of the workplace must

be gained via verbal report of the co-worker reported to be involved in the social interaction.

Verbal report

Verbal report of target employee and co-worker who participated in the following potential social activities.

- Attending sports or public events
- Attending movies
- Socializing at bars or dances
- Socializing at company sponsored functions such as Christmas party or summer agency picnic
- Eating out
- Visiting each other's homes
- Sharing transportation
- Attending church together
- Other (please specify for future reference)

Item 7:

Advocating — The co-worker advocates for the target employee by optimizing, backing, and supporting the target employee's employment status.

2- A co-worker optimizes, backs, and supports the target employee's employment status. This level of support is provided by the co-worker when needed without the assistance or prompting of others.

1- A co-worker optimizes, backs, and supports the target employee's employment status. This level of support is provided by the co-worker when needed with assistance and/or prompting from others.

0- A co-worker does not advocate (optimize, back, support) for the target employee's employment status.

Instructions for Scoring Item 7

The employment training specialist or supervisor directly observes the target employee and co-workers around him/her during actual work on-the-job, breaks, transitions (e.g., task or location change) and lunch to determine instances of advocating by co-worker(s). Co-worker's verbal reports may be elicited. For a co-worker's solicited or unsolicited verbal report of advocating to be considered valid, the report must be corroborated by one of the following persons; supervisor, employment training specialist, target employee or another co-worker: The employment training specialist's or supervisor's report of an occurrence of advocating will be accepted without corroboration.

Observations

- During lunch and work breaks
- During actual work on the job
- During transitions (e.g., task or location change)

Verbal report

- By co-workers or target employee
- By supervisor or employment training specialist

Relevant documents

- Direct observational records as recorded by supervisor or employment training specialist, such as daily observational data

Item 8:

Evaluating — A co-worker evaluates and provides (written/verbal) feedback to the target employee.

2- The co-worker appraises the target employee's performance and provides (written/verbal) feedback to the target employee.

1- The co-worker evaluates the target employee's performance without providing written/verbal feedback directly to the target employee.

0- The co-worker does not evaluate or provide feedback to the target employee.

Instructions for Scoring Item 8

The employment training specialist or supervisor directly observes the co-worker when acting in a supervisory role, to assess the co-worker's performance as an evaluator of the target employee's skills. Relevant documents such as evaluative forms used by the co-worker also are considered. Co-worker's verbal reports may be elicited. For a co-worker's or target employee's solicited or unsolicited verbal report of information giving to be considered valid, the report must be corroborated by one of the following persons: supervisor, employment training specialist, target employee or another co-worker. The employment training specialist's or supervisor's report of an occurrence of evaluating will be accepted without corroboration.

Observations

- During lunch and work breaks
- During actual work on the job
- During transitions (e.g., task or location change)

Verbal report

- By co-workers or target employee
- By supervisor or employment training specialist

Relevant documents

- Direct observational records as recorded by supervisor or employment training specialist, such as daily observational data
- Work Performance Evaluation Form (WPEF)
- Company personnel evaluation form
- Informal evaluation instruments
- Individualized Written Rehabilitation Plan (IWRP)

Item 9:

Giving Information — The co-worker provides information spontaneously to the target employee.

2- The co-worker spontaneously volunteers instruction/feedback and answers questions for the target employee.

1- The co-worker provides information to the target employee only when directly asked a question.

0- The co-worker discourages target employee's information seeking behavior by not providing information or answering questions.

Instructions for Scoring Item 9

The employment training specialist or supervisor directly observes the target employee during actual work on the job, breaks, during transitions (e.g., task or location change) and lunch to determine instances of information giving by co-workers. Co-worker's or target employee's verbal reports may be elicited. For a co-worker's or target employee's solicited or unsolicited verbal report of information giving to be considered valid, the report must be corroborated by one of the following persons: supervisor, employment training specialist, target employee, or another co-worker. The employment training specialist's or supervisor's report of an occurrence of information giving will be accepted without corroboration.

Observations

- During lunch and work breaks
- During actual work on the job
- During transitions (e.g., task or location change)

Verbal report

- By co-workers or target employee
- By supervisor or employment training specialist

Relevant documents

- Direct observational records as recorded by supervisor or employment training specialist, such as daily observational data

Part 2: Co-Worker Involvement Instrument

Instructions for Scoring Employment Site Demographics

Question 1: Use the target employee's social security number to identify the target employee for whom the scale is being scored.

Question 2: Enter the target employee's job title based upon the employee's job description.

Question 3: Indicate how long (in years and months), the target employee has held his/her present job.

Question 4: Indicate (by circling supervisor or employment training specialist) who is completing the instrument. Name the employment training specialist or supervisor who is completing the scale. Refer to the glossary for definitions of supervisor and employment training specialist.

Question 5: Indicate the type of placement (i.e., individual, clustered or dispersed placement, mobile work crew).

Question 6: Indicate the type of job the target employee performs.

Question 7: Indicate the number of visits the employment training specialist currently makes to the employment site to visit with the target employee.

Question 8: Indicate the length of time that the employment training specialist has been working with the target employee at the employment site.

Question 9: Indicate the total number of employees working at the employment site.

Question 10: Indicate the number of male (M) and female (F) nonhandicapped co-workers who work in the same work area as the target employee when he/she is at work. Then indicate the number of male (M) and female (F) co-workers with handicaps who work in the same work area as the target employee when he/she is at work.

Question 11: Indicate the number of nonhandicapped co-workers who do tasks similar to those performed by the target employee in the same work area when he/she is at work. Then indicate the number of co-workers with handicaps doing tasks similar to those performed by the target employee in the same area when he/she is at work.

Co-worker Involvement Instrument

Date _____

Time _____

Employment Site Demographics

1. Target employee's identification number _____

2. Target employee's job title _____

3. Target employee's time on job _____ years _____ months

4. Scorer (supervisor or employment training specialist) identification

   _____

5. Type of Placement:

   ____ Individual
   ____ Dispersed group
   ____ Clustered group
   ____ Mobile crew

6. Type of Job:

   ____ Light industrial
   ____ Warehouse
   ____ Retail
   ____ Clerical
   ____ Other _____
   ____ Laundry
   ____ Maintenance (janitorial and/or grounds)
   ____ Food Service
   ____ Health Care

7. Employment Training Specialist involvement at the work site:

   ____ daily
   ____ once a week
   ____ twice a month
   ____ less than once a month
   ____ 2-4 times per week
   ____ 3 times per month
   ____ once a month

8. The length of time that the employment training specialist has been familiar with the job site:

   ____ 3-5 months
   ____ 10-12 months
   ____ 6-9 months
   ____ more than one year

9. Approximate total number of employees at the employment site. _____

10. Number of co-workers that work in the same area as the target employee when the target employee is at work. ____ M ____ F nonhandicapped workers ____ M ____ F co-workers with handicaps.

11. Number of co-workers that perform similar tasks as the target employee.

    ____ non-handicapped co-workers
    ____ co-workers with handicaps

Co-worker Involvement Items

Item 1: Physical Integration - The target employee works, takes breaks, and eats meals in the same areas at the same time as the co-worker(s). 2 1 0

2	- Works , eats, takes breaks in same area at same time
1	- Does not work in same area at same time but takes breaks and/or eats in same area at same time (or vice versa)
0	- Does not work, take breaks, or eat in same area at same time

Item 2: Social Integration - While completing his/her work or during breaks, the target employee regularly has opportunities to interact with co-workers without negative effects on job performance. 2 1 0

2	- Regularly occurring opportunities for interaction
1	- Few opportunities for interaction
0	- No opportunities for interaction

Item 3: Training - The co-worker supports a target employee by providing on-the-job skill training. 2 1 0

2	- Co-worker independently provides on-the-job training to target employee
1	- Co-worker provides on-the-job training when prompted and/or assisted
0	- Co-worker does not provide on-the-job training to target employee

Item 4: Associating (frequency) - A co-worker socially interacts with the target employee at the work place. 2 1 0

2	- Co-worker socially interacts with target employee typically on a daily basis
1	- Co-worker socially interacts with target employee typically only 2 to 3 times per week
0	- Co-worker socially interacts with target employee once a week or less

Item 5: Associating (appropriateness) - A co-worker socially interacts with the target employee in a manner considered appropriate within the context of the work place. 2 1 0

2 - Most social interactions are appropriate 1 - Some social interactions are appropriate 0 - Few social interactions are appropriate

Item 6: Befriending - A co-worker befriends the target employee by interacting socially with the target employee outside of the work place. 2 1 0

2 - Interaction occurs at least once a month 1 - Interaction occurs less than once a month 0 - Interaction does not occur

Item 7: Advocating - The co-worker advocates for the target employee by optimizing, backing, and supporting the target employee's employment status. 2 1 0

2 - Co-worker advocates independently 1 - Co-worker advocates with assistance or prompting 0 - Co-worker does not advocate

Item 8: Evaluating - A co-worker evaluates and provides (written/ verbal) feedback to the target employee. 2 1 0

2 - Co-worker evaluates and provides feedback 1 - Co-worker evaluates without providing feedback 0 - Co-worker does not evaluate or provide feedback

Item 9: Giving Information - The co-worker provides information spontaneously to the target employee. 2 1 0

2 - Co-worker spontaneously gives information 1 - Co-worker gives information only when asked by target employee 0 - Co-worker does not give information even when asked

TOTAL SCORE _____ (0 - 18)

Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge the following Illinois supported employment model programs for providing comments on earlier versions of this instrument:

Ada S. McKinley Community Services
Alliance for the Mentally Ill of Rock Island and Mercer Counties
Aid to Retarded Citizens, Inc.
Belleville Mental Health Out-Patient Clinic
Center for Disabled Student Services
The Center for Rehabilitation and Training of Persons with Disabilities
Chicago Association for Retarded Citizens
Chicago Lighthouse for the Blind
Comprehensive Services
Cornerstone Services Inc./Will Co. Sheltered Workshop
Countryside Association for the Handicapped, Inc.
Developmental Services Center
Effingham Association for Retarded Citizens
Effingham County Guidance and Counseling Center
El Valor Corporation
Employer Resource Service/Arrise
Franklin-Williamson Workshop
Happiday Centers, Inc.
Institute For Human Development
Iroquois ARC
Job Resources for the Disabled
Lake County Society for Human Development
The Lambs, Inc.
Maine Township School District
Marionjoy Rehabilitation Center
McDonough County Rehabilitation Center
Mental Health Centers of Central Illinois
Mid Valley Special Ed Cooperative
North Shore Association for the Retarded
Northwest Mental Health Center
Occupational Developmental Center
Open Door Rehabilitation Center
Opportunity House, Inc.
Orchard Village
Park Lawn
Ray Graham Association
Seguin Services, Inc.
Sertoma Career Center
SHORE Community Services for Retarded Citizens
Skills Incorporated
SIU School of Medicine/Community Support Network
Special Education Parents Alliance
Spectrum Vocational Services
United Cerebral Palsy of Lincoln Land

Victor C. Neumann Association
Warren Achievement Center

The authors gratefully acknowledge the following individuals for assistance:

Robert Gaylord-Ross
Hyrum Park
Renee Cameto
Phyllis Tappe
James Strauch
Roger Bushton

References

Bellamy, G. T., Rhodes, L. E., Bourbeau, P. E., & Mank, D. M. (1986). Mental retardation services in sheltered workshops and day activity programs: Consumer benefits and policy alternatives. In F. R. Rusch (Ed.), Competitive employment issues and strategies (pp. 257-271). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Chadsey-Rusch, J. (1986). Identifying and teaching valued social behaviors in competitive employment settings. In F. R. Rusch (Ed.), Competitive employment issues and strategies (pp. 273-287). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Chadsey-Rusch, J., & Gonzalez, P. (1986). Social ecology of the workplace: Coding categories and rules. Champaign: Transition Institute, University of Illinois.

Chadsey-Rusch, J., & Gonzalez, P. (1988). Social ecology of the workplace: Employers' perceptions versus direct observation. Research in Developmental Disabilities, 9, 229-245.

Crouch, K. P., Rusch, F. R., & Karlan, G. P. (1984). Competitive employment: Utilizing the correspondence training paradigm to enhance productivity. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 19, 268-275.

Federal Register. (September 25, 1984). Developmental Disabilities Act of 1984. Report 98-1074, Section 102 (11) (F).

Federal Register. (August 14, 1987). The State Supported Employment Services Program, 52 (157), 30546-30552.

Kochany, L., Simpson, T., Hill, J., & Wehman, P. (1982). Reducing noncompliance and inappropriate verbal behavior in a moderately retarded food service worker: Use of a systematic fading procedure. In P. Wehman & M. Hill (Eds.), Vocational training and job placement of severely disabled persons (pp. 128-139). Richmond: School of Education, Virginia Commonwealth University.

Lagomarcino, T. R., & Rusch, F. R. (1988). Competitive employment: Overview and analysis of research focus. In V. B. Van Hasselt, P. S. Strain, & M. Hersen (Eds.), Handbook of developmental and physical disabilities (pp. 150-158). New York: Pergamon Press.

McNair, J., & Rusch, F. R. (1989). This volume.

Menchetti, B. M., & Rusch, F. R. (1988). Analysis of select psychometric properties of the Vocational Assessment and Curriculum Guide. American Journal on Mental Retardation, 93, 283-289.

Nisbet, J., & Hagner, D. (in press). Natural supports in the workplace: A reexamination of supported employment. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps.

Rusch, F. R. (1986). Introduction and developing a long-term follow-up program. In F. R. Rusch (Ed.), Competitive employment issues and strategies (pp. 3-67, 225-232). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Rusch, F. R., Hughes, C., Johnson, J. R., & Minch, K. E. (1988). A descriptive analysis of co-worker involvement in supported employment. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Rusch, F. R., Johnson, J. R., & Hughes, C. (1990). Analysis of co-worker involvement in relation to level 4 disability versus placement approach among supported employees. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 15(1), 32-39.

Rusch, F. R., & Menchetti, B. M. (1981). Increasing compliant work behaviors in a non-sheltered work setting. Mental Retardation, 19, 107-111.

Rusch, F. R., & Minch, K. E. (1988). Identification of co-worker involvement in supported employment: A review and analysis. Research in Developmental Disabilities, 9, 247-254.

Rusch, F. R., & Mithaug, D. E. (1980). Vocational training for mentally retarded adults: A behavior analytic approach. Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Rusch, F. R., Morgan, T. K., Martin, J. E., Riva, M., & Agran, M. (1985). Competitive employment: Teaching mentally retarded employees self-instructional strategies. Applied Research in Mental Retardation, 6, 389-407.

Rusch, F. R., Schutz, R. P., Mithaug, D. E., Stewart, J. E., & Mar, D. K. (1982). VACG: The Vocational Assessment and Curriculum Guide. Seattle, WA: Exceptional Education.

Rusch, F. R., Trach, J. S., Winking, D. L., Tines, J. L., & Schutz, R. P. (1987). Introduction to supported employment in Illinois: Current status of the initiative. In F. R. Rusch & J. S. Trach (Eds.), Supported employment in Illinois: Program implementation and evaluation (Vol. 1, pp. 1-16). Champaign: Transition Institute, University of Illinois.

Rusch, F. R., Weithers, J. A,. Menchetti, B. M., & Schutz, R. P. (1980). Social validation of a program to reduce topic repetition in a non-sheltered setting. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 15, 208-215.

Schutz, R. P., Jostes, K. F., Rusch, F. R., & Lamson, D. S. (1980). Acquisition, transfer, and social validation of two vocational skills in a competitive employment setting. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 15, 306-311.

Schutz, R. P., Rusch, F. R., & Lamson, D. S. (1979). Eliminating unacceptable behavior: Evaluation of an employer's procedures to eliminate unacceptable behavior on the job. Community Service Forum, 1, 5-6.

Shafer, M. S. (1986). Utilizing co-workers as change agents. In F. R. Rusch (Ed.), Competitive employment issues and strategies (pp. 215-224). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Stanford, K., & Wehman, P. 91982). Improving social interactions between moderately retarded and nonretarded coworkers: A pilot study. In P. Wehman & M. Hill (Eds.), Vocational training and job placement of severely disabled persons (pp. 141-159). Richmond: School of Education, Virginia Commonwealth University.

Trach, J. S., Rusch, F. R., & DeStefano, L. (1987). Supported employment program development: Degree of implementation manual. Champaign: Transition Institute, University of Illinois.

White, D. M., & Rusch, F. R. (1983). Social validation in competitive employment: Evaluating work performance. Applied Research in Mental Retardation, 4, 343-354.